

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on April 1, 2010. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-10 and 29-31 will be pending.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office action rejected several claims under 103(a). To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. Knowledge of applicant's disclosure must be put aside in reaching this determination, yet kept in mind in order to determine the "differences," conduct the search, and evaluate the "subject matter as a whole" of the invention.¹ Finally, a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.²

A. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31

Specifically, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starkovich et al US 6,993,585 ("Starkovich") in view of DeLuca et al US 7,545,124 ("DeLuca"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that for at least the following reasons claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31 are patentable over the combination of Starkovich and DeLuca.

Independent claim 1 recites in part, "generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received by...wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system." Independent claim 29 recites similar limitations. For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that Starkovich does not disclose the above features.

Starkovich generally relates to a process for "facilitating on-line processing requests, and more specifically, to adapting client formats to the use of a single gateway in communicating

¹ See MPEP 2142.

² *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983); MPEP § 2143.03

with an On-Line Transaction Processing (OLTP) Enterprise Server from user work stations."³ More specifically, Starkovich discloses WebTx, a *generic gateway* that permits a user of a work station to communicate with other internet applications.⁴ A client sends a service request to an associated adapter.⁵ The adapter subsequently converts the input from the client to a standardized format for the generic gateway.⁶ The converted and processed service requests are transferred from the generic gateway to an appropriate connector of a plurality of connectors.⁷

However, Starkovich does not teach or suggest "generating... a customized connection... interface by modifying [a] generic connector interface," as recited in independent claim 1.⁸ Rather, Starkovich merely translates information received, i.e. information related to a given enterprise system, into a standardized format that is compatible with a generic gateway. Importantly, the generic gateway keeps its generic characteristics.

As described in the present application, a customized connector interface is generated by modifying a set of properties of the existing generic interface. The modifications fit the requirements necessary to access and communicate with a particular, already existing, interface used to access a particular information system.⁹ Hence, the newly created customized connector interface is customized based on the properties of the particular information system interface.

In the Office action, Examiner cited column 8, lines 38-47 of the Starkovich reference, asserting that clients of a WebTx can access enterprise applications using processing information made of a custom gateway.¹⁰ However, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited text refers to a custom gateway interface. Rather, the cited text refers to the capabilities of the Unisys ClearPath *server*, specifically referring to how the ClearPath server can access enterprise applications. A server is not a gateway. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office action is improperly attributing functionality of a server to a gateway. Moreover, Starkovich explicitly describes a *generic gateway*, not a custom gateway.

³ See Starkovich, column 1, lines 33-38.

⁴ See Starkovich, column 3, lines 43-52.

⁵ See Starkovich, column 6 lines 63-67 and column 7 lines 10.

⁶ See Starkovich, column 6 lines 63-67 and column 7 lines 10.

⁷ See Starkovich, column 3, lines 43-52, column 6 lines 63-67 and column 7 lines 10

⁸ See Independent claim 1

⁹ See Specification, page 8.

¹⁰ See Office action, page 4.

DeLuca does not cure the defects of Starkovich, as DeLuca only generally relates to a method and system for implementing a user interface in a client management tool.¹¹ The user interface allows a user to select polling agents in the management tool. The polling agents collect data from computer networks and the networks components.¹² However, applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does DeLuca teach or suggest generating a customized connector interface by modifying a generic connector interface.

Claims 2-3 and 5-7, and 30-31 depend from claims 1 and 29 respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that a dependent claim incorporates each of the claim elements of the independent claim from which it properly depends. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3 and 5-7, and 30-31 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of the claims from which they depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 9 and 10

Additionally, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starkovich in view of DeLuca, and further in view of Ng ("Ng") US 6,411,956. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that for at least the following reasons claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the combination of Starkovich, De Luca, and Ng.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1. As discussed above regarding claim 1, Starkovich does not teach or suggest "generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received by...wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system," as recited in independent claim 1.

Ng does not cure the defects of Starkovich as Ng only generally relates to a method for distributed transaction support using JDBC drivers, not generating a customized connector interface by modifying a generic connector interface. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Starkovich, DeLuca, and Ng does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 9 and 10 as a whole. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 10 are patentable over Starkovich, De Luca, and Ng.

¹¹ See DeLuca, Abstract

¹² See DeLuca, column 1, lines 45-55


V. Conclusion

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. Applicant respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Assignee believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 501662 as necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2010



Gregory P. Durbin, Reg. No. 42,503
Agent for Assignee
USPTO Customer No. 66083

POLSINELLI SHUGHART, P.C.
1515 Wynkoop, Suite 600
Denver, CO 80202
720.931.8133 direct
720.228.2310 facsimile